

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/016,437	12/10/2001	Nader Dutta	594-25576-US	5333	
28116 WesternGeco	7590 04/16/200 L.L.C	EXAMINER			
Jeffrey E. Grif	fin	JONES, HUGH M			
10001 Richmo HOUSTON, T	nd Avenue X 77042-4299	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
,			2128		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/16/2009	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lgoldsmith@slb.com aperalta2@slb.com rsmith31@slb.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)					
10/016,437	DUTTA ET AL.					
Examiner	Art Unit					
Hugh Jones	2128					

	riugii Jolles	2120						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 02 April 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.						
☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filling a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of the application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.							
<ul> <li>The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ta</li> </ul>	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(I	).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	iled within two months	of the date of					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>								
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to</li> </ol>			cause					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor		E below);						
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below								
<ul><li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti appeal; and/or</li></ul>	ter form for appeal by materially red	lucing or simplifying ti	ne issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finding reju	otou diamio.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment (	PTOL -324)					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inpliant / tinonamont (i	I OL OL+).					
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the					
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [     how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving the proposed amendment of the proposed ame</li></ol>		be entered and an e	planation of					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) allowed Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: 1-8, 12-15, 17-27, 29-32. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>								
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	to provide a					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).								
13. Other:								
	/Hugh Jones/							
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2128						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments regarding the art rejections are not persuasive.

Page 230: The elastic earth models (consisting of P-wave velocity, density, and Poisson's ratio) obtained at each location of the prospect where prestack GAinversion was run can be used as background low-frequency impedance trends for poststack inversion and can create a hybrid inversion scheme. Two such hybrid schemes are fully described by Mallick et al. (1999) and summarized below.

Mallick then discloses (pp. 230-231)... compute P- and S-wave impedances from prestack data and use standard AVO processing to generate AVO intercept and AVO gradient volumes. Next, we assume a background P- to S-wave velocity raid on orbinite the AVO intercept and gradient volumes to generate a pseudo S-wave volume. A derivation for computing pseudo S-wave data from the AVO intercept and gradient is presented in Appendix A. Finally, we run poststack inversions on AVO intercept and code S-wave volumes, using P- and S-wave impedance values from prestack inversion at discrete locations as background impedance trends. Once P- and S-wave impedances from these poststack inversions are obtained, we can compute Poisson's ratio according to Appendix B.

Note from above " Next, we assume a background P- to S-wave velocity ratio, and combine the AVO intercept and gradient volumes to generate a pseudo S-wave volume". The s wave data is derived from the P data via the assumed ratio. Thus, the section cited in the rejection is only directed to P wave data.

also note: "A derivation for computing pseudo S-wave data from the AVO intercept and gradient is presented in Appendix A".

Finally, see section "A".

The argument regarding a lack of teaching of any stratigraphic analysis is not persuasive. The whole paper is directed to stratigraphic analysis.

Applicants are thanked for the amendment.